



Interactive comment on “Tsunami response system for ports in Korea” by H.-R. Cho et al.

Anonymous Referee #3

Received and published: 6 June 2015

The paper presents a management plan to mitigate tsunami damages and losses to the ports along the eastern Korean Peninsula. The paper is clear, logical, and been well written. Having that said, I also feel the paper is more like a technical report from a consultant company rather than a technical paper published by academia (even though the third author has an excellent track record on conducting and publishing academic research in the subject area). But that may be just my own bias.

Based on my reading, I have the following minor comments:

1. I do not feel the abstract tells what this paper is about. It tells the “aim,” but does not indicate or imply it is indeed a planning and management paper that mainly features guidelines associated with rules and policies. There are many ways to mitigate or minimize losses from tsunamis, including numerical modeling, physical modeling, planning and management, etc. so it is not as clear as what I would like to see.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper



2. Adding an EAP flow chart would be useful. The chart may summarize the technical sections to avoid having to read through section by section again if one wants to utilize the study.
3. The authors aim to mitigate losses. Losses are associated with risk. It would be useful if the authors can mention or elaborate risk or risk analysis.
4. It is misleading in the Introduction (lines 17-19, page 2026) by saying “Every year, the major seaports of Korea and their surrounding areas suffer extensive damage from marine disasters, such as tsunamis, seawater flooding, and typhoons.” Tsunamis are rare events, but it sounds like tsunamis occur every year.
5. Line 15, page 2027 – The word “inundation” was used, but I believe the authors mean flood damages.
6. Line 3, page 2030. What do the authors mean about “Farm environments”? I don’t see a connection between that and the rest of the sentence/paragraph.
7. Line 22, page 2038. What is the justification of using the 10 m elevation (even though it sounds reasonable)? It must be associated with runup from the 4 m maximum inundation depth. Please elaborate.

Interactive comment on Nat. Hazards Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 3, 2025, 2015.

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper